

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32
March 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

RESPONSE TO NOTICE TO ADVISE OF SCHEDULING CONFLICTS

Case Number: 24-1278, -1354

Short Case Caption: CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd. v. Apple Inc.

Party Name(s): Apple Inc.

INFORMATION: The court uses this form to determine whether and when to schedule cases for oral argument. Arguing counsel may be changed later, but a motion to reschedule is required once the court schedules argument. Please plan in advance to adhere to the limit on the number of arguing counsel in Fed. Cir. R. 34(e).

Argument Waiver ☐ My party intends to waive oral argument.

NOTE: Filers checking this box must still complete the below sections. **The court may still schedule this case for oral argument even if any party intends to waive argument.** If scheduled, parties may still elect to waive argument using the response to notice of oral argument form.

Other Parties Representing Interests

☐ Counsel for another party will represent my party's interests at oral argument

NOTE: If this box is checked, skip the remaining sections. Any argument date will be selected based on conflict dates for counsel arguing on behalf of your party.

Name of Expected Arguing Counsel	Seth W. Lloyd
---	---------------

Dates Unavailable

Do you have dates of unavailability within the specific sessions identified by the court's Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts in your case?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing **up to ten dates** of unavailability and **include a statement showing good cause for each date.** Dates without good cause or that do not pertain to arguing counsel (e.g., client conflicts) will not be accepted. The court will only accept dates for one counsel and only if that counsel has filed an entry of appearance. The Clerk's Office will evaluate and note accepted or rejected conflict dates; counsel may contact the Clerk's Office about re-filing if dates are rejected. *See* Fed. Cir. R. 34(d); Practice Notes to Rule 34.

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32
March 2023

Potential Case Conflicts

Are there other pending cases before this court (regardless of case status) in which expected arguing counsel in this case also expects to argue?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing those cases.

I certify the above information and any attached statement is complete and accurate. I further certify that I will update my notice should new conflicts arise or existing conflicts change.

Date: August 12, 2024

Signature: /s/ Seth W. Lloyd

Name: Seth W. Lloyd

Potential Case Conflicts

Arguing counsel also expects to argue the following pending cases. If one or more of these are set for the same sitting, counsel respectfully requests that the Court allow at least one day in between each argument to prepare, consistent with the Court's guidance with respect to allowable scheduling conflicts, which indicates the Court will accept one day of hearing preparation as a conflict:

AMS-OSRAM USA Inc. v. Renesas Electronics America, Inc.,

Nos. 22-2185, -2186

Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit LLC, Nos. 22-2025, -2028, -2029, -2030,

-2032, -2037

Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit LLC, No. 23-1526

Fate Therapeutics, Inc. v. Shoreline Biosciences, Inc. No. 24-1021

Dated: August 12, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Seth W. Lloyd

SETH W. LLOYD

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

2100 L Street, NW, Suite 900

Washington, DC 20037

Telephone: (202) 887-6946

SLloyd@mofo.com

Counsel for Appellee Apple Inc.